

A Glen Lau Lian Seng v Personal representative of Jeswant a/l Natarajan, deceased

**B HIGH COURT (KUALA LUMPUR) — CIVIL SUIT NO
WA-22NCC-346-10 OF 2016
AZIZUL AZMI ADNAN J
19 JUNE 2017**

**C *Succession — Administration — Appointment of ‘representative’ — Appeal
against decision of registrar of court — Registrar refused to set aside order
appointing defendant as representative — Whether court may order nominated
person to be personal representative against person’s wishes — Whether next of kin
entitled to refuse appointment — Whether consent a requirement of O 15 r 6A***
D — Rules of Court 2012 O 15 r 6A

**E This was an appeal to the judge in chambers against the decision of the registrar
of this court to refuse an application by a widow to set aside an order
appointing her as the representative of the estate of her estranged departed
husband. Mr Glen Lau Lian Seng (‘the plaintiff’), a business partner of
Mr Jeswant Natarajan (‘the deceased’) contended that he had made a number
of friendly loans, totalling in excess of RM1.2m to the deceased in 2014. After
Mr Natarajan’s death, the plaintiff commenced this action to recover the loans.**
**F As there was no executor or administrator appointed to represent the estate of
the deceased, the plaintiff made an ex parte application under O 15 r 6A of the
Rules of Court 2012 (‘the ROC’) for an order for Ms Dorothea Winkelmayer
to be appointed as the representative of the estate of her late husband. She had
been separated from the deceased for many years and had not spoken to him
until shortly before his death. Ms Winkelmayer’s application to set aside the
order was refused. Hence, this appeal. The main issue for determination related
to the manner in which the court was to exercise its discretion to appoint a
person as a representative pursuant to O 15 r 6A(4) of the ROC and whether
the court may order a nominated person to be the personal representative
against such person’s wishes. The plaintiff argued that consent was not a
requirement of O 15 r 6A of the ROC. Based on this premise, the plaintiff
further argued that Ms Winkelmayer ought to be ordered to be appointed as
the representative of her late husband’s estate solely on the basis that she was the
next of kin.**

I **Held, allowing the appeal with costs:**

- (1) The court may appoint any person to represent the estate of a deceased if it was just to do so, taking into account the relevant surrounding circumstance of the case. Based on the circumstances of the case, it would

not be just for Ms Winkelmayer to be so appointed. The factors taken into account were: there was no consent and indemnity; no evidence to suggest that Ms Winkelmayer was a beneficiary of the estate; and Ms Winkelmayer was separated from her husband (see paras 7–9).

- (2) Consent was not an express requirement of O 15 r 6A. Further, the real issue was not whether consent must be obtained before the court may grant an order under O 15 r 6A(4)(a). Subrule 6A(4)(a) provided for a discretion of court. It was axiomatic that any such discretion must be exercised judicially and consent was a relevant consideration in determining whether or not the court ought to exercise its discretion to grant the order sought. Therefore, the existence of consent was a very important element in determining the order appointing the nominated representative (see paras 8(a) & 11).
- (3) A next of kin would be entitled to refuse the appointment. In such circumstances, there would have to be overwhelmingly compelling reasons for the court to appoint such a next of kin over his or her objections (see para 17).

[Bahasa Malaysia summary]

Ini adalah rayuan kepada hakim dalam kamar terhadap keputusan pendaftar mahkamah ini menolak permohonan seorang balu untuk mengeneipkan perintah pelantikannya sebagai wakil harta pusaka mendiang suaminya yang telah berpisah. Encik Glen Lau Lian Seng ('plaintif'), rakan kongsi perniagaan Encik Jeswant Natarajan ('si mati') berhujah bahawa dia telah membuat beberapa pinjaman atas dasar berkawan, berjumlah RM1.2 juta kepada si mati pada 2014. Selepas kematian Encik Natarajan, plaintif telah memulakan tindakan ini untuk mendapat balik pinjaman-pinjaman itu. Oleh kerana tiada wasi atau pentadbir yang dilantik untuk mewakili harta pusaka si mati, plaintif telah membuat permohonan ex parte di bawah A 15 k 6A Kaedah-Kaedah Mahkamah 2012 ('KM') untuk perintah agar Puan Dorothea Winkelmayer dilantik sebagai wakil harta pusaka mendiang suaminya. Dia telahpun berpisah dengan si mati untuk beberapa tahun dan tidak bercakap dengannya sehinggalah sebelum kematiannya. Permohonan Puan Winkelmayer untuk mengetepikan perintah itu telah ditolak. Justeru, rayuan ini. Isu utama untuk ditentukan adalah berkaitan cara mahkamah patut menggunakan budi bicaranya untuk melantik seseorang sebagai wakil menurut A 15 k 6A(4) KM dan sama ada mahkamah boleh memerintahkan orang yang dicalonkan menjadi wakil peribadi yang bertentangan dengan hasrat orang tersebut. Plaintif berhujah bahawa Puan Winkelmayer patut diperintahkan agar dilantik sebagai wakil harta pusaka mendiang suaminya semata-mata atas dasar yang dia ialah waris kadim.

Diputuskan, membenarkan rayuan dengan kos:

- A (1) Mahkamah boleh melantik sesiapa untuk mewakili harta pusaka si mati jika ia adalah adil untuk berbuat sedemikian, dengan mengambil kira keadaan sekeliling yang berkaitan dengan kes. Berdasarkan keadaan kes, ia adalah tidak adil untuk Cik Winkelmayr dilantik. Faktor-faktor yang perlu diambil kira adalah: tiada persetujuan dan indeminiti; tiada keterangan untuk mencadangkan bahawa Cik Winkelmayr adalah benefisiari harta pusaka itu; dan Cik Winkelmayr telah berpisah dengan suaminya (lihat perenggan 7–9).
- B
- C (2) Persetujuan bukan keperluan A 15 k 6A. Selanjutnya, isu sebenar adalah bukan sama ada persetujuan perlu diperoleh sebelum mahkamah boleh memberikan perintah di bawah A 15 k 6A(4)(a). Subkaedah 6A(4)(a) memperuntukkan bagi budi bicara mahkamah. Ia tidak boleh disangkal bahawa mana-mana budi bicara sedemikian perlu digunakan secara adil dan persetujuan adalah balasan relevan dalam menentukan sama ada atau tidak mahkamah patut menggunakan budi bicaranya untuk memberikan perintah yang dipohon. Oleh itu, kewujudan persetujuan adalah elemen penting dalam menentukan perintah untuk melantik wakil yang dicalonkan (lihat perenggan 8(a) & 11).
- D
- E (3) Keluarga terdekat berhak untuk menolak pelantikan. Dalam keadaan sedemikian, perlu ada hujah-hujah yang mendorong mahkamah melantik keluarga terdekat atas bantahannya (lihat perenggan 17).]

Notes

- F For a case on appointment of ‘representative’, see 11(2) *Mallal’s Digest* (5th Ed, 2015) para 2381.

Cases referred to

- G *Curtis and Betts, Re* [1887] WN 126 (folld)
Hasiyah bt Mat lwn Johanariffin bin Din dan lain-lain [2010] 7 MLJ 61; [2009] 11 MLRH 83, HC (refd)
Kerajaan Malaysia v Yong Siew Choon [2006] 1 MLJ 1; [2006] 2 AMR 93; [2005] 4 CLJ 537; [2005] 2 MLRA 185, FC (refd)
- H *Lean v Alston* [1947] 1 All ER 261, CA (refd)
Poraviappan a/l Arunasalam Pillay (suing as administrator of estate of the late Nadarajah a/l Sithambaram Pillai) v Periasamy a/l Sithambaram Pillai & Ors (on behalf of personal representatives of the estate of Ponnammal a/p Ramasamy the deceased) [2015] 4 MLJ 285; [2015] 4 AMR 445; [2015] 6 CLJ 857; [2015] 4 MLRA 275, FC (refd)
- I *Pratt v London Passenger Transport Board; Green v Vandekar* [1937] 1 All ER 473, CA (folld)
Yong Siew Choon v Kerajaan Malaysia [2003] 2 MLJ 150; [2003] 2 AMR 682; [2003] 2 CLJ 106; [2003] 1 MLRA 53, CA (folld)

Legislation referred to

Rules of Court 2012 O 15 rr 6A, 6A(4), (4)(a), 7, 15

D Paramalingam (Krish Maniam & Co) for the plaintiff.
V Kumar (Kumar Jaspal Quah & Aishah) for the defendant.

Azizul Azmi Adnan J:

INTRODUCTION

[1] This is an appeal to the judge in chambers against the decision of the registrar of this court to refuse an application by a widow to set aside an order appointing her as the representative of the estate of her estranged departed husband. The issue turns on the relevant considerations that the court may take into account when making an order for a person to be the representative of a deceased pursuant to O 15 r 6A of the Rules of Court 2012 and the related subsidiary question of whether the court may order a nominated person to be the personal representative against such person's wishes.

BACKGROUND FACTS

[2] The plaintiff, Mr Glen Lau Lian Seng, was a business partner of the deceased, Mr Jeswant Natarajan. The plaintiff contended that he had made a number of friendly loans to Mr Natarajan in 2014, which loans totalled in excess of RM1.2m. Unfortunately Mr Natarajan passed away of a heart attack in April 2016. The plaintiff commenced this action after his death to recover the loans.

[3] The nominated representative, Ms Dorothea Winkelmayer, is the widow of the deceased. It is not disputed that Ms Winkelmayer had been separated from the deceased for several years. According to her affidavit evidence, she also had not spoken to the deceased for several years, at least until shortly before his passing.

[4] As there was no executor or administrator appointed to represent the estate of the deceased, the plaintiff made an ex parte application under O 15 r 6A of the Rules of Court 2012 for an order for Ms Winkelmayer to be appointed as the representative of the estate of her late husband. This application was heard by the registrar of this court, and was allowed on 24 November 2016.

[5] Ms Winkelmayer subsequently applied to set aside the order, but this application was refused. She has now appealed against this decision of the registrar.

A ANALYSIS

B [6] It is clear that O 15 r 6A(4) provides for the judicial power and discretion to order the appointment of any person to represent the estate of a deceased in proceedings against the estate of the deceased. In the absence of any such order, proceedings cannot be properly maintained against the estate of the deceased until and unless a grant of probate or administration has been made and the personal representative is made a party to such proceedings. In such circumstances, the official administrator may be appointed solely for the purposes of accepting service of process.

D [7] The crisp issue for determination relates to the manner in which the court is to exercise its discretion to appoint a person as a representative pursuant to O 15 r 6A(4). In my view, the court may appoint any person to represent the estate of a deceased if it is just to do so, taking into account the relevant surrounding circumstances of the case.

E [8] Based on the circumstances of this case and having regard to the evidence that is properly before this court, I find that it would not be just for Ms Winkelmayr to be so appointed, and I therefore allow the appeal and set aside the orders of the registrar previously given. The factors that I have taken into consideration are as follows:

F (a) no consent. Ms Winkelmayr has not consented to being appointed as the representative of her late husband's estate. As we shall see later, I am in agreement with counsel for the plaintiff that consent is not an express requirement of O 15 r 6A. Nonetheless, I am of the view that the fact of consent is a relevant consideration in determining whether or not the court ought to exercise its discretion to grant the order sought.

G The basic proposition is this: if the court orders that a person acts as a personal representative of the estate of a deceased in proceedings against such estate, that person will, in the course of defending the action, incur liability for which he or she may not be made whole. The court ought to be slow to impose any liability on a third party in any action in circumstances where there exists no cause of action against that third party. Thus, to my mind, the existence of consent is a very important element in determining whether or not the court ought to grant the order appointing the nominated representative.

I I leave open the possibility that the court may properly exercise its discretion under O 15 r 6A(4) to appoint a nominated representative against such person's wishes. However, it would appear to me that the circumstances must be such as to overwhelmingly favour the appointment of a person to act as the personal representative of an estate

of a deceased in the absence of any consent of that person. Certainly, the mere fact that the person is a next of kin of the deceased does not justify the grant of the order;

A

- (b) no indemnity. The plaintiff has not provided any indemnity to Ms Winkelmayer for any personal liability or expense that she may incur in representing the estate. In my view, if an appropriate indemnity is given to the nominated representative, the court could conceivably grant the order to appoint the nominee even in the absence of consent. Even here though, the court would be concerned that the nominated representative would act in the best interests of the prospective beneficiaries of the estate and would defend the claim in an appropriate manner. Such an order would lay the representative open to an action from the beneficiaries of the estate at a later stage, and hence careful consideration ought to be given to the surrounding circumstances even where an indemnity has been given;

B

C

D

- (c) no evidence to suggest that Ms Winkelmayer is a beneficiary of the estate. Counsel for the plaintiff conceded that there is no evidence that is properly before this court that suggests that the assets of the estate exceeds its liabilities and that Ms Winkelmayer would stand to benefit from the distribution of the assets of the estate. If such were the case, an argument may be mounted to justify the appointment of a nominated representative even in absence of consent. However, such is not the case in the present instance; and

E

- (d) Ms Winkelmayer was separated from her husband. The undisputed evidence was that Ms Winkelmayer had been separated from the deceased for some years prior to his passing and that they were not in regular communication. This is of course not in and of itself determinative or decisive but is nonetheless one of the factors to be taken into account by the court. If they had been separated for a number of years in life, it would be an imposition to make her responsible for his affairs in death.

F

G

[9] Accordingly, having regard to the relevant circumstances of this case, I am of the view that it would not be just to order Ms Winkelmayer to be appointed as the personal representative of the estate of her late husband.

H

[10] Counsel for the plaintiff sought to argue that consent is not a requirement that has been set out anywhere in O 15 r 6A, and that Ms Winkelmayer ought to be ordered to be appointed as the representative of her late husband's estate solely on the basis that she is the next of kin.

I

[11] I am in total agreement with Mr Paramalingam for the plaintiff that consent is not an express requirement of O 15 r 6A. However, with respect, the

- A real issue is not whether consent must be obtained before the court may grant an order under O 15 r 6A(4)(a). Subrule 6A(4)(a) provides for a discretion of the court, and it is axiomatic that any such discretion must be exercised judicially. In my view, a court may exercise its discretion to grant an order sought under r 6A(4)(a) where it is just to do so, having regard to all the relevant surrounding circumstances of the case. One of the relevant circumstances that the court may validly take into account is whether the nominated representative has consented to so act.
- B
- C [12] In his grounds for decision, the learned registrar criticised the reliance placed by learned counsel for Ms Winkelmayr on the two English cases of *Pratt v London Passenger Transport Board*; *Green v Vandekar* [1937] 1 All ER 473 and *Re Curtis and Betts* [1887] WN 126. In these cases, it was held that the consent of the nominated representative was required before they may be ordered to represent the estate of the deceased. The learned registrar distinguished these cases on two grounds, which are set out in the following passage from his decision:
- D
- E After reading both cases I find that such authorities provided can be distinguished on its application to the present case. In *Pratt's* case, the case specifically deals with the appointment of a person representing the estate of a deceased person under O 16 r 46 of the Rules of the Supreme Court which is in pari materia with our O 15 r 15 of the Rules of Court 2012. As such the principle derives therein should rightly be applicable to an appointment made under O 15 r 15. Secondly, both in *Pratt's* case and *Re Curtis's* case, the person appointed whom consent was not obtained are not lawful next of kin of the deceased as in our case at hand. In *Pratt's* case, the person appointed is the official solicitor whereas in *Re Curtis*, it was the executor of Curtis that was appointed to represent the estate of Betts for the purpose of taxation proceeding against their deceased client R Stainbank (Curtis and Bett acted as the solicitors for R Stainbank).
- F
- G [13] I take the contrary view.
- H [14] Order 15 r 6A allows actions to be brought against the estate of a deceased person in circumstances where there has not been any grant of probate or administration. Order 15 r 7, by contrast, deals with the change of parties in an action that has already commenced, while O 15 r 15 deals with the representation of deceased persons also where the action has already commenced.
- I [15] In my judgment, even though the cases of *Pratt v London Passenger Transport Board* and *Re Curtis and Betts* did not concern the equivalent of our O 15 r 6A, they are nonetheless instructive for the following reasons:
- (a) like O 15 r 6A, O 15 r 15 of the Rules of Court 2012 does not expressly provide that the consent of the nominated representative be obtained

prior to an order being given, but yet the courts in England have held that consent is a precondition for appointment. Accordingly, it is no answer to state that no consent is required simply because there is no express provision requiring consent to be obtained;

- (b) like O 15 r 6A, O 15 r 15 is concerned with the proper exercise of judicial discretion to appoint a person to act as a representative of a deceased person. That this is so can be seen from the judgment of Greer LJ in *Pratt v London Passenger Transport Board*:

We were invited to make observations with reference to what ought to be the general rule for the court or a judge when applications are made to them in exercising their discretion under RSC Ord 16, r 46. For my part I think it unwise to lay down any general rule with regard to a matter which is a matter for discretion, because no two cases are the same. It may be that in some cases it would be held to be clearly inconvenient to make an order under this rule, whereas in other cases it might appear to be an adequate and proper method of dealing with the difficulty. I do not think we can, in advance, lay down any rule as to how the discretion should be exercised in these cases.

If consent is a relevant consideration for the proper exercise of judicial discretion under O 15 r 15, then I see no reason why it should also not be the case under O 15 r 6A; and

- (c) the rationale for consent to be obtained was also explained in the judgment of Greer LJ:

Now, if the deceased person is somebody who would have had to incur expense in the litigation, his representative will necessarily have to incur expense in the litigation, and the court may well think that this is not a proper case in which to make an appointment of the official solicitor, or anybody else who may be considered suitable for the appointment under the provisions of the rule, without his consent. It seems to me quite impossible to suppose that this rule applies without the consent of the person who may have to be acting in the litigation and incurring expense in doing so, which may be partly disbursements or, if it is the official solicitor, his time and expenses as solicitor.

In my view, the rationale for consent would be equally applicable to an appointment of a representative under O 15 r 6A. The personal representative would in all likelihood incur expenditure in defending the suit. I cannot see how it would be just for the court to order a person to become a representative against his or her wishes (and as a consequence cause such person to incur costs), except perhaps if the nominated representative were in some way indemnified against the costs that he or she might incur, or if the circumstances were such as would overwhelmingly favour the appointment of such person even in the absence of consent.

- [16] The second distinguishing feature identified by the learned registrar in

A *Pratt v London Passenger Transport Board* and *Re Curtis and Betts* was that they did not concern a nominated representative who was a next of kin.

B [17] In my judgment, the fact that the nominated representative was not a next of kin does not change the analysis or the applicable principles. A next of kin would be well entitled to refuse the appointment, and in such circumstances, I would venture that there would have to be overwhelmingly compelling reasons for the court to appoint such a next of kin over his or her objections.

C [18] In *Lean v Alston* [1947] 1 All ER 261, the widow of a motorcycle driver had been asked to take out letters of administration and had refused to do so. The plaintiff, who was the pillion rider, had sued the owner of the motorcar that had collided with the motorcycle. The defendant sought to serve a third party notice upon the estate of the deceased motorcycle driver but could not initially do so because of the widow's refusal. In the following passage of the judgment of the Court of Appeal, it will be seen that the court was of the view that the widow could validly decline from representing the estate of her deceased husband, even though she was the next of kin:

E The other argument on which I desire to make a few observations is this. It was pointed out that this is a matter for the discretion of the judge and that this court would not interfere with the exercise of a judge's discretion unless satisfied he had acted on some wrong principle. We were also informed that the judge refused to make the appointment because he did not think that the widow of the deceased motor cyclist, being a person beneficially interested in his estate, should have this representation 'imposed on her'. If that is what influenced the judge's mind, I think he did exercise his discretion on a wrong principle. The widow was invited to represent her husband's estate and she declined to do so, it may be for very good reasons not unconnected with the question of costs. For all we know, the widow may be glad that another person (who is, we understand, to be indemnified in respect of his costs by the defendant) should represent her husband's estate, and it may well be that in the long run it will save that estate the expense of a subsequent trial and possibly of an application to the Probate Division to appoint a personal representative.

H [19] Even though *Lean v Alston* also concerns a decision on the application of the English equivalent of O 15 r 15, as explained earlier, I am of the view that similar considerations apply under O 15 r 6A.

I [20] It is also important to appreciate that O 15 r 6A provides for one exception to the general rule, which is that actions by or against an estate of a deceased can and should only be maintained after grant of probate or administration. The context within which O 15 r 6A operates is best explained by the following passage in the judgment of Gopal Sri Ram JCA in the Court of Appeal case of *Yong Siew Choon v Kerajaan Malaysia* [2003] 2 MLJ 150;

[2003] 2 AMR 682; [2003] 2 CLJ 106; [2003] 1 MLRA 53:

To summarise, the rule of substantive law is that an action may be commenced and maintained by or against the estate of a deceased after, and only after, letters of representation have been extracted. Order 15 r 6A provides a very limited exception to that substantive rule by permitting the commencement of an action against the estate of a deceased even before the extraction of letters of representation. But it regulates the future prosecution of the action by requiring (in r 6A(4)) certain steps to be taken in that respect and specifying the time limited for the taking of such steps.

[21] Now, it will be observed that the decision of the Court of Appeal was reversed on appeal to the Federal Court (see *Kerajaan Malaysia v Yong Siew Choon* [2006] 1 MLJ 1; [2006] 2 AMR 93; [2005] 4 CLJ 537; [2005] 2 MLRA 185), but the passage quoted above remains a correct statement of the law.

[22] Because O 15 r 6A operates as a limited exception to the general rule, there is all the more reason that the court must satisfy itself that the circumstances of the case are such that the grant of an order appointing a person to act as a representative of the estate of a deceased person would be just. To hold that consent of the nominated representative is unnecessary simply because the requirement for consent has not been expressly spelt out in r 6A would be to erode the general rule that letters of representation must first be obtained before an action may be commenced against or by the estate of a deceased. The general rule should not be honoured more in breach than in observance. There may well be circumstances where a court may find it just to order that a person be appointed as a representative pursuant to O 15 r 6A of the Rules of Court 2012 over his objections, but this cannot mean that consent is an irrelevance.

[23] I now turn to the authorities cited by learned counsel for the plaintiff:

- (a) in *Poraviappan a/l Arunasalam Pillay (suing as administrator of estate of the late Nadarajah a/l Sithambaram Pillai) v Periasamy a/l Sithambaram Pillai & Ors (on behalf of personal representatives of the estate of Ponnammal a/p Ramasamy the deceased)* [2015] 4 MLJ 285; [2015] 4 AMR 445; [2015] 6 CLJ 857; [2015] 4 MLRA 275, the appellant, who was seeking specific performance of an agreement for the purchase of land against the estate of the deceased vendor, had sought an order to appoint the deceased's brother as the representative of the estate. The Federal Court held that the brother had been duly appointed pursuant to O 15 r 6A of the Rules of Court 2012 and so the action for specific performance could validly be maintained against the estate. However, nowhere in this case was it mentioned that the brother had not consented to his appointment. Thus this case cited by counsel for the

- A plaintiff does not assist us in determining the issues under consideration in our present case; and
- (b) in *Hasiah bt Mat lwn Johanariffin bin Din dan lain-lain* [2010] 7 MLJ 61; [2009] 11 MLRH 83, the relevant issue before the court was whether the application for the appointment of the personal representative must be first be served upon each beneficiary of the estate of the deceased before any appointment may validly be made. Su Geok Yiam J held that no such requirement exists under O 15 r 6A of the Rules of Court 2012. Thus, here again the court was not concerned with the issue of whether the personal representative in question had consented to act.
- B
- C

[24] For the reasons set out above, I allow the appeal with costs.

- D *Appeal allowed with costs.*

Reported by Nisha Paran

E

F

G

H

I